

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of September 8, 2004.

All of the points raised by the Examiner are addressed herein. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is requested. Claims 1-18 remain in the application and claims 19 and 20 are added after this amendment is entered.

The Office Action

Claims 1-4 and 13-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over U.S. Patent No. 6,128,017 to Alimpich et al. (Alimpich) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,852,436 to Franklin et al. (Franklin).

Claims 5-12, 17, and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for obviousness over Alimpich in view of Franklin and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,987,535 to Knodt et al. (Knodt).

The Art Rejections

Claims 1-4 and Claims 13-16 Patentably Distinguish Over the Combination of Alimpich and Franklin.

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1 and 13 for obviousness over Alimpich in view of Franklin. In support of rejection of claim 13, the Examiner states that "Alimpich discloses a method comprising the step of displaying a fault screen including at least one device fault button." With respect to the "at least one device fault button," the Examiner refers to item 52 of Fig. 4, item 51 of Fig. 2, and column 4, lines 14-16 and 19-21 of Alimpich. Notably, items 51 and 52 identify a single error button in a user selectable region below an error log window 53, a clear button 57, and a close button 56. The error button changes state from a normal state, as depicted in Fig. 2, to an error attention state, as depicted in Fig. 4. In the error attention state, selection of the error button 51 displays the error log window 53 with new and existing error conditions associated with a data processing system. (Column 3, line 65 – Column 4, line 38)

As amended, claim 1 recites "a fault screen window on a display screen and including multiple device fault buttons." Neither Alimpich nor Franklin suggest or fairly a fault screen window that includes multiple device fault buttons.

Moreover, the applicants respectfully disagree that Alimpich and Franklin are combinable. First, the display screen 50 in Alimpich presents the status of printers and the status of jobs within a window. (Column 3, line 65 – Column 4, line 2) Notably, this display screen is dedicated for this specific purpose. On the other hand, Franklin discloses a central notes facility for generating and managing notes that may be attached to objects throughout a data processing system. The central notes facility may be part of an operating system, a separate system resource, or an independent application. The central notes facility may be accessed within different applications. The note objects generated by the central notes facility are movable in that the objects in which they are attached may be changed (i.e., they are not permanently bound to a given object). The note objects that are generated and managed by the central notes facility may contain different types of data (e.g., text, bit maps, etc.), and the contents of the note objects may be readily edited. (Column 3, lines 10-26) Notably, the flexibility offered by the central notes facility in Franklin does not lend itself to a dedicated application such as the display screen disclosed in Alimpich. Rather, a dedicated application would have to include a number of supplemental rules and controls with respect to the use of the central note facility disclosed in Franklin.

Based on the foregoing, the applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 and claims dependent thereon (including claims 2-4) are currently in condition for allowance with respect to the combination of Alimpich and Franklin.

As amended, independent claim 13 now recites “said fault screen window including multiple device fault buttons” in similar fashion to amended claim 1. Therefore, amended claim 13 is distinguished from Alimpich for the same reasons as stated above for claim 1. Additionally, the applicants respectfully disagree that Alimpich and Franklin are combinable with respect to claim 13 for the same reasons as stated above for claim 1. Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 13 and claims dependent thereon (including claims 14-16) are currently in condition for allowance with respect to the combination of Alimpich and Franklin.

Claims 5-12, 17, and 18 Patentably Distinguish Over the Combination of Alimpich, Franklin, and Knott

The Examiner has rejected independent claim 7 for obviousness over

Alimpich in view of Franklin and in further view of Knott. The Examiner acknowledges that "Alimpich in view of Franklin does not disclose expressly... a fault icon for each device having a fault condition that is displayed in the proximity of an icon representing said device." In support of the rejection, however, the Examiner states that Knott discloses an icon that shows a print job status and references item 62 of Figure 5 and column 4, lines 34-39 of Knott. Apparently, the Examiner relates the print job status of the Knott icon to the fault icon recited in claim 7. The applicants respectfully disagree with this correlation. Notably, Knott has not disclosed or fairly suggest that status conditions include faults or errors. Rather, the status conditions in Knott reflect progress of a job, such as time and percentage of a copy job, a print job, or a fax job.

Moreover, the applicants respectfully disagree that Alimpich and Franklin are combinable with respect to claim 7 for the same reasons stated above for claim 1.

Therefore, the applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 7 and claims dependent thereon (claims 8-12) are currently in condition for allowance.

Moreover, as amended, dependent claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, and 18 now recite "multiple device fault buttons." Therefore, each of these dependent claims is distinguishable from Alimpich for the same reasons as stated above for claim 1. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 17, and 18 are currently in condition for allowance with respect to the combination of Alimpich, Franklin, and Knott.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 1-20) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment A. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark S. Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

12/8/04

Date



Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582